

REMARKS

The applicant has now had an opportunity to carefully consider the comments set forth in the Office Action mailed December 9, 2005. All of the rejections are respectfully traversed. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

THE OFFICE ACTION

In the Office Action mailed December 9, 2005:

the Supplemental Declaration filed on November 15, 2005 was found to be effective to overcome U.S. Patent No. 6,259,907 to Bellamy, Jr., et al. ("Bellamy"); and **claims 1-12 and 15-22** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,317,484 B1 to McAllister, et al. ("McAllister") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,549,918 B1 to Probert, Jr., et al. ("Probert").

The Present Application

By way of brief review, the present application identifies and addresses a problem in the prior art that is not recognized or addressed by the cited references. The problem recognized and addressed by the subject matter of the present application is that prior art telecommunication switch data retrievers require that users retrieving switch data have an extensive knowledge about the particular switch database being queried. In the past, persons interested in examining switch data had to be proficient in the special query commands peculiar to the switch database. Furthermore, prior art methods of data review require the generation and transmission of individual queries for each database entry of interest. Alternatively, a group of data could be downloaded into a large text file through which the user would have to manually sift. For example, direct access to Recent Change and Verify (RC/V) screens require knowledge of a large number of access keys, of which some persons having interest in the data may not be familiar. Alternatively, the user could execute a large number of time-consuming query commands to identify such keys. Moreover, such keys could vary from switch database to switch database and depend on many factors which may not be familiar to persons having interest in the data (e.g., page 2, lines 4-16, of the present application).

To address this problem, the present application discloses and claims systems and methods wherein raw switch data collection is automated and raw switch data is converted into a format that is compatible with a predefined spreadsheet program.

Therefore, where the systems and methods of present application are available, the uninitiated can collect and easily understand the information represented by the raw switch data. For example, systems of the present application can speed and ease new product introduction and testing or during customer acceptance testing. Data format converting can be bi-directional. Therefore, a technician can reconfigure a switch or switch information in a database of a switch without knowing the details of the switch database commands. For instance, a script can be used to convert spreadsheet data entries or changes into commands for changing related values in a switch database.

The Cited References

In contrast, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of McAllister and Probert does not disclose or suggest a system for automating the transfer of switch data or the conversion of switch data so that it can be viewed, understood and manipulated through the use of a predetermined spreadsheet program.

Furthermore, even if the combination of McAllister and Probert could be construed as suggesting the conversion of raw switch data, there is no motivation in the art to make the combination.

For example, the primary reference of the Office Action to McAllister allegedly discloses "transportable control of services" wherein a personal dial tone service is used to identify the user of a subscriber line to a telephone terminal and, based on that identification, the system and method dynamically configures that line with the personal profile of that user. Such a line is used in a roaming situation to provide voice mail service to the roamer through an emulation of the roamer's home voice mail interface (Abstract). It is respectfully submitted that McAllister is unrelated to displaying switch data or to converting switch data to an understandable format.

The Office Action relies on McAllister for disclosure of receiving raw switch data from a digital switch or switching system, wherein the raw switch data is stored by the digital switch or switching system in a switch database. However, it is respectfully submitted that the cited portions of columns 7, 9 and 10 of McAllister do not disclose or suggest receiving raw switch data from a digital switching system. It is respectfully submitted that column 7, lines 44-46, identify the kinds of equipment used in a central office switching system. However, they do not disclose or suggest raw switch data or a database therefor. Moreover, even if column 7, lines 44-64, is considered to suggest raw switch data or a database therefor, **McAllister does not disclose or suggest**

receiving raw switch data from a digital switch or switching system.

Column 9, line 61 - column 10, line 7, discuss some operations that occur during "a normal call." However, the cited paragraph does not discuss or mention raw switch data or a database. Moreover, column 9, line 61 - column 10, line 7, does not disclose or suggest receiving raw switch data from a digital switching system, wherein the switch data is stored by the digital switching system in a switch database.

The cited portion of column 16 discusses events that occur when a call comes in to a voice mail system or when a call is forwarded call. However, column 16, lines 27-54, do not disclose or suggest raw switch data or a database therefor. Moreover, the cited portion of column 16 does not disclose or suggest receiving raw switch data from a digital switching system, wherein the raw switch data is stored by the digital switching system in a switch database.

The cited portions of column 8 describe an Integrated Service Control Point (ISCP) as including a database of called processing information. However, an integrated service control point (ISCP) is not a switch and call processing records (CPRs) do not represent raw switch data. Furthermore, column 8, lines 16-46, does not disclose, discuss or suggest raw switch data such as records of switch hardware changes, switch software changes, responses to testing, troubleshooting routines or new product installations. Even if call processing records are considered raw switch data related to switching activities, the cited portion of column 8 does not disclose or suggest receiving call processing records from a digital switch or switching system for the purpose of outputting or displaying them with a spreadsheet.

It is respectfully submitted that Probert does not remedy these deficiencies of McAllister.

For example, Probert allegedly discloses a software layer residing between software components or application programs running locally or on a client across a network, and a persistent store of an operating system that provides on-the-fly conversions of persistent information formats.

For instance, Probert allegedly addresses the issue that occurs "when a user buys a new computer loaded with the latest software, produces a document, and gives a copy of the document to someone else, only having a previous version of the software, the copy can be useless and indecipherable by the previous version (column 1, lines 55-59). Another example of the problem addressed by Probert arises "when a user desires to share documents and other files over a network with a person using a

different operating system, or application, or even a different version of the same operating system or application. If the different systems use different formats for the operating system components, they may have difficulty sharing information. In particular, the newer system or application may use an information format that was invented after the earlier system was developed. These difficulties also arise with different applications that use a common type of information, but expect different formats, such as image processing applications that use JPEG instead of GIF, or document processors which use HTML instead of Word7 format. Incompatibilities can also be due to the file systems or other persistent stores used by different operating systems (column 1, line 60 - column 2, line 8). Probert does not disclose or suggest receiving raw switch data from a digital switch or switching system, wherein the raw switch data is stored by the digital switching system in a switch database.

The Claims are not Obvious

Claims 1-12 and 15-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over McAllister in view of Probert.

In explaining the rejection of **claim 1**, the Office Action asserts that McAllister discloses receiving raw switch data from a digital switching system, wherein the raw switch data is stored by the digital switching system in a switch database.

However, as indicated above, it is respectfully submitted that the cited portions of columns 7-10 do not disclose or suggest receiving raw switch data from a digital switching system as asserted by the Office Action.

Column 7, lines 44-64, discuss equipment that might be included within a central office switching system. However, they make no mention of raw switch data or receiving raw switch data from a digital switching system.

Column 8, lines 16-46, indicate that an ISCP may be a general purpose computer storing a database of call processing information and mentions call records (CPRs). However, it is respectfully submitted that an ISCP is not a switch. Furthermore, even if CPRs are considered raw switch data, the cited portions of column 8 do not disclose or suggest receiving raw switch data from a digital switching system for the purpose of displaying that data in a spreadsheet or otherwise.

Column 9, line 61 - column 10, line 7, describes activities associated with a "normal call." The activities include the office retrieving profile information and a switch receiving dialed digits. However, it is respectfully submitted that profile information and

dialed digits are not raw switch data stored in a database of a switch and the cited portions of columns 9 and 10 do not disclose or suggest raw switch data or a device receiving raw switch data from a digital switching system.

Column 16, lines 27-54, describe activities associated with a call coming into a voice mail system or when an incoming call is forwarded. However, the cited portion of column 17 does not disclose or suggest raw switch data or receiving raw switch data from a digital switching system.

Additionally, the Office Action stipulates that McAllister does not disclose converting raw switch data into a format compatible with a predefined spreadsheet program and outputting converted data to and storing said converted data in at least one predefined workbook of said spreadsheet program.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that McAllister does not recognize any need or desire for receiving or displaying any raw switch information in a user-friendly manner or provide any other motivation for a combination including Probert.

The Office Action relies on Probert for disclosure of converting said raw data into a format compatible with a predefined spreadsheet program. In support of the assertion that Probert discloses this information, the Office Action directs the attention of the Applicant to FIG. 2 and column 8, lines 17-59. However, FIG. 2 of Probert is a high-level block diagram showing the relationship between a filter driver of Probert and other operating environment programs.

However, column 8, lines 17-35, indicate that an application residing on a server system can utilize system libraries and components and accesses data stored on the server through an I/O manager. Additionally, this portion of Probert indicates that two filter drivers can be stacked across the network, and conversion modules within a particular system can also be stacked. Thus, if there is a conversion provided between formats A and B on the client side, and between B and C on the server side, they can be stacked to get conversion between A and C.

Column 8, lines 36-59, indicate that in some embodiments, the conversion modules provide for conversion of data for different versions of a single application, such as between documents stored in a Word 7.0 format and a Word 8.0 format. Further conversion modules can provide data from different applications, such as other word processors, spreadsheets or imaging programs which have their own formats for storing data. One example of such a format is the tag-based format of hypertext markup language (HTML). In this example, a word processor which is not tag based,

may store a document in one format, and an HTML editor may request access to that document in HTML format. Upon receiving such a request to open the file containing the document, the filter driver may invoke a conversion module to perform dynamic conversion and provide an HTML view of the document to the HTML editor.

However, it is respectfully submitted that nothing in FIG. 2 or the cited portion of column 8 discloses or suggests receiving **raw switch data** from a **digital switch or switching system** or converting **raw switch data** to a format compatible with a predefined spreadsheet.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted the cited references do not disclose or suggest the subject matter for which they are relied. Therefore, **claim 1**, as well as **claims 2-6, 9 and 10**, which depend therefrom is not obvious in light of McAllister and Probert taken alone or in any combination.

Furthermore, the Office Action stipulates that McAllister and Probert do not disclose outputting converted data to and storing said converted data in at least one predefined workbook of said spreadsheet program. Instead, the Office Action simply asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified McAllister and Probert to include said outputting and storing features.

However, it is respectfully submitted that there is simply no motivation in the art, other than that found in the present application, to combine Probert and McAllister. The Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to combine Probert into McAllister since Probert discloses the benefit of converting data in one format to the spreadsheet format applied in the network system, providing the advantage to incorporate into McAllister for converting the raw data stored in the switch database the table format in McAllister into the spreadsheet format for easily performing calculations related to business.

However, McAllister does not disclose or suggest any table format or any need or desire to perform calculations relating to business. Therefore, the Office has not met its obligation to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Additionally, as indicated above, the references do not disclose or suggest all the claim limitations (e.g., receiving raw switch data, converting raw switch data). Therefore, for at least this second reason, the Office has not met the basic requirements of a *prima facie* case of obviousness (MPEP 2143).

For at least the foregoing additional reasons, **claim 1**, as well as **claims 2-6, 9**

and **10**, which depend therefrom, is not anticipated and is not obvious in light of McAllister and Probert taken alone or in any combination.

With regard to **claim 2** and **3**, the Office Action directs the attention of the Applicant to column 7, lines 44-46, of McAllister. However, **claims 2** and **3** recite performing said receiving, converting and outputting steps as part of a new product introduction test and a customer acceptance test, respectively. The cited portion of column 7 discusses elements that may be included within a central office switching system. However, the cited portion of McAllister does not disclose or suggest that raw data is received from a digital switching system, converted into a format compatible with a predefined spreadsheet program and stored in a predefined workbook as part of a new product introduction test or customer acceptance test. McAllister and Probert do not disclose or suggest new product introduction tests or customer acceptance tests.

For at least the foregoing additional reasons, **claims 2** and **3** are not anticipated and are not obvious in light of McAllister and Probert taken alone or in any combination.

With regard to **claims 4-6**, the Office Action directs the attention of the Applicant to portions of McAllister related to using scripts in transferring profile data. However, **profile data is not raw switch data**. Furthermore, **claims 4, 5** and **6** recite executing said scripts to modify the switch database associated with the raw switch data. The scripts discussed in McAllister are not for modifying a database associated with raw switch data. Instead, the scripts direct the operation of the host processor in an Intelligent Peripheral (IP) in interaction with a switch, and Integrated Service Control Point (ISCP) and voice mail system at a remote locale (column 17, lines 48-50).

For at least the foregoing reason, it is respectfully submitted that the Office has not met the basic requirements for establishing a case of *prima facie* obviousness and **claims 4, 5** and **6** are not anticipated and are not obvious in light of McAllister and Probert taken alone or in any combination.

With regard to independent **claim 7**, it appears that the Office Action meant to reject **claim 7** under the same rationale as **claim 1**, although the rejection makes reference to **claim 12**. In this regard, arguments similar to those submitted in support of **claim 1** are submitted in support of **claim 7**.

For at least the foregoing reasons, **claim 7**, as well as **claims 8, 11** and **12**, which depend therefrom, is not anticipated and is not obvious in light of McAllister and Probert taken alone or in any combination.

Claim 9, which depends from **claim 1**, recites wherein the raw switch data

includes at least one of hardware change data, software change, switching activity data, testing data, troubleshooting data and new product installation data.

In support of the assertion that McAllister discloses the subject matter of **claim 9**, the Office Action directs the attention of the Applicant to column 14, lines 59-63, and asserts that the information disclosed therein discusses testing data.

However, the cited portion of McAllister describes a process whereby a new subscriber or user would get on line with the intelligent peripheral serving that subscriber and train that intelligent peripheral by speaking certain phrases. From the received audio signals represented in those phrases, the intelligent peripheral would store templates or other pattern information for use in identifying and/or verifying that a caller is a particular subscriber. During actual call processing, a voice authentication module receives speech information from the caller. The voice authentication module compares the received information to its stored template for feature data to identify a calling party as a particular subscriber. **It is respectfully submitted that an intelligent peripheral is not a switch and this training and voice authentication data do not represent raw switch data or testing data associated with a switch.**

For at least the foregoing additional reason, **claim 9** is not anticipated and is not obvious in light of McAllister and Probert taken alone or in any combination.

Claim 10, which depends from **claim 1**, recites wherein the raw switch data includes Recent Change and Verify data. In support of the assertion that McAllister discloses the subject matter of **claim 10**, the Office Action directs the attention of the Applicant to column 11, lines 22-45. However, the cited paragraphs discuss operations associated with profile data. It is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that raw switch data is a reference to all data maintained in a switch/office. Recent Change/Verify data would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art to refer to a subset of raw switch data that is accessible to a service provider for viewing and/or modification. For example, Recent Change/Verify data includes values and settings associated with timers, hardware configuration information and trunk group definitions. Profile data is associated with a subscriber. Profile data is not raw switch data. Moreover, profile data does not include or suggest Recent Change or Verify data.

For at least the foregoing additional reason, **claim 10** is not anticipated and is not obvious in light of McAllister and Probert taken alone or in any combination.

Claims 11-12 were rejected under the same rationale as **claims 9** and **10**. In

this regard, arguments similar to those submitted in support of **claims 9 and 10** are submitted in support of **claims 11 and 12**.

For at least the foregoing additional reasons, **claims 11 and 12** are not anticipated and are not obvious in light of McAllister and Probert taken alone or in any combination.

In explaining the rejection of **claim 15**, the Office Action asserts that McAllister discloses receiving raw switch data from a digital switch. However, as indicated above with regard to **claim 1**, it is respectfully submitted that the cited portions of columns 7-10 do not disclose or suggest receiving raw switch data from a digital switch.

Arguments similar to those submitted in support of **claim 1** are submitted in support of **claim 15**. For the foregoing reasons, **claim 15**, as well as **claims 17 and 18**, which depend therefrom, is not obvious in light of McAllister and Probert taken alone or in any combination.

Furthermore, the Office Action stipulates that McAllister and Probert do not disclose outputting converted data to and storing said converted data in at least one predefined workbook of said spreadsheet program. Instead, the Office Action simply asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified McAllister and Probert to include said outputting and storing features.

However, it is respectfully submitted that there is no motivation in the art, other than that found in the present application, to combine Probert and McAllister.

The Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to combine Probert into McAllister since Probert discloses the benefit of converting data in one format to the spreadsheet format applied in the network system, providing the advantage to incorporate into McAllister for converting the raw data stored in the switch database the table format in McAllister into the spreadsheet format for easily performing calculations related to business.

However, McAllister does not disclose or suggest any table format or any need or desire to perform calculations relating to business. Therefore, the Office has not met its obligation to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Additionally, as indicated above, the references do not disclose or suggest all the claim limitations (e.g., receiving raw switch data, converting raw switch data). Therefore, for at least this second reason, the Office has not met the basic requirements of a *prima facie* case of obviousness (MPEP 2143).

For at least the foregoing additional reasons, **claim 15**, as well as **claims 17 and 18**, which depend therefrom, is not anticipated and is not obvious in light of McAllister and Probert taken alone or in any combination.

In explaining the rejections of **claims 17 and 18**, the Office Action makes reference to Bellamy. However, Bellamy has been removed as a reference (see item 3 on page 2 of the Detailed Action). Insofar as the Office intended to make reference to McAllister instead of Bellamy, arguments similar to those submitted in support of **claims 9 and 10** are submitted in support of **claims 17 and 18**.

Claims 19, 21 and 22 were rejected under the same rationale as **claims 15-18**. In this regard, arguments similar to those submitted in support of **claims 15-18** are submitted in support of **claims 19, 21 and 22**. **Claim 20** depends from **claim 19** and is patentably distinct and not obvious for at least that reason.

For at least the foregoing reasons, **claim 19**, as well as **claims 21 and 22**, which depend therefrom, is not anticipated and is not obvious in light of McAllister and Probert taken alone or in any combination.

With regard to **claims 16**, the Office Action directs the attention of the Applicant to portions of McAllister related to using scripts in transferring profile data. However, profile data is not raw switch data. Furthermore, **claim 16** recites executing said scripts to modify the switch database associated with the raw switch data. The scripts discussed in McAllister are not for modifying a database associated with raw switch data. Instead, the scripts direct the operation of the host processor in an intelligent peripheral in interaction with a switch, ISCP and voice mail system at a remote locale (column 17, lines 48-50).

For at least the foregoing reason, it is respectfully submitted that the Office has not met the basic requirements for establishing a case of *prima facie* obviousness and **claim 16** is not anticipated and is not obvious in light of McAllister and Probert taken alone or in any combination.

Telephone Interview

In the interests of advancing this application to issue the Applicant(s) respectfully request that the Examiner telephone the undersigned to discuss the foregoing or any suggestions that the Examiner may have to place the case in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-12 and 15-22 remain in the application. For at least the reasons detailed above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, an early indication thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & MCKEE, LLP

January 31, 2006
Date

Joseph D. Dreher
Joseph D. Dreher, Reg. No. 37,123
Thomas Tillander, Reg. No. 47,334
1100 Superior Avenue
7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582

Certificate of Mailing

Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8, I certify that this Amendment is being

- ☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail, addressed to Mail Stop AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.
- ☐ transmitted via facsimile in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.8 on the date indicated below.
- ☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the date indicated below and is addressed to the Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Express Mail Label No.:	Signature <i>Iris E Weber</i>
Date <i>January 31, 2006</i>	Printed Name Iris E Weber

N:\LUTZ\200156\IEW0003693V001.doc